

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Regular Meeting of 18 March 1985

ATTENDANCE

Present: Aberbach, Ascione, Bailey,
Bassett, Briggs, Boyd, Bulkley,
Burdi, Catford, Chudacoff, Cohen,
Thornton, Easley, King, English,
Eschman, Green, Glover, Hilbert,
Hopwood, Janecke, Kaplan, Kelsey,
Knudsvig, Kusnerz, Larson,
Lehmann, Weigel, Loup, Lusk,
McClamroch, Moerman, Mosher,
Nadelman, Powell, Radine, Reed,
Rucknagel, Rutledge, Sanders,
Scheele, Schteingart, Sears,
Simon, Lewis, Stapp, Stebbins,
Whitehouse, Yocum

Absent: Barald, Beutler, Burt, Dahlke,
Danielson, Farley, Fellin, Grosse,
Gulari, Hanks, Herbert, Howe,
Jacobs, Kahn, Hacker, Lawrence,
Leonard, Lockwood, Lorey, Ludema,
Deshpande, Margolis, Mermier,
Meyer, Payne, Rae, Veroff,
Schauer, Snyder, Solomon, Taylor,
Warschausky, Zweifler

Professor Hilbert convened the meeting at 3:21 p.m.

MINUTES

The minutes of 18 February 1985 were approved as written.

ELECTION TO SACUA

Hilbert stated that election would be for three members for three year terms each, beginning April 1, 1985. According to past procedure, Assembly members are to rank all nominees with the three receiving the lowest total scores winning election. Failure to rank all candidates invalidates the ballot. Judith Nowack and Sharron Wenzel will serve as tellers. He then introduced the candidates and asked each to stand: Joel Aberbach (LSA); Edward Chudacoff (Music); Myra Larson (Art); Charles Lehmann (Education); N. Harris McClamroch (Engineering); Daniel Moerman (UM-Dearborn); Frank Whitehouse (Medicine).

Professor Cohen drew attention to the letter from the Academic Women's Caucus and its implied lack of confidence in the nominating process. SACUA, in his view, is not a sexist group. SACUA shares this view and, Hilbert reported that he has replied via letter noting its role, record and continuing female members.

Ballots were then distributed, marked and collected.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TENURE ISSUES LIAISON GROUP

Professor Stebbins, reporting for both SACUA and the faculty members of the Tenure Issues Liaison Group, presented two documents for consideration. These were "'Appointments Specifically Designated Without Tenure'" and "Rules Concerning the Acquisition of the Protections of Regents' Bylaw 5.09 by Accumulating Years of Service". He stated that neither document is intended as a replacement of RB 5.09 but as an interpretation of it. In 1974 Senate Assembly approved two earlier versions but these did not gain Administration approval. The current versions have been discussed twice this year by AAAC (Council of Deans and Directors) and stand a good chance of acceptance. Approval by the Assembly would enhance those prospects.

Referring to the second document, Section I, Background, Professor Lehmann suggested re-phrasing "The University permits" to "The Regents permit" if that is the intention. In Section II, Rules, Professor Lusk asked if the definition of full-time as 80% represents a change. Professor Stebbins replied no, that some units, e.g., Engineering, have long defined full-time as 80%. Professor Lusk replied that the School of Nursing had recently been advised by Personnel that anything less than 100% is not full-time. Thus the document represents a change in practice and will have a negative impact on Nursing. Professor Chudacoff elaborated that some faculty would therefore not be competitive for tenure, would need to have part-time appointments to stop the tenure clock and would not re-start the tenure clock until they could devote full-time effort to assembling a record for a favorable tenure review.

In reply to Professor Easley's question, Professor Stebbins said that the provisions would not be retroactive. To ensure this, Professor Bailey suggested amending Section II, C, to either April 1, 1985 or a later date after Regental approval of the documents.

Professor Lusk stated that discussion in schools and colleges would be desirable prior to Assembly action. Professor Lehmann concurred, noting that the Assembly Tenure Committee had not reviewed the documents. Professor Green reported that the document had been in committee last year and was subsequently moved to the Tenure Liaison Group to move consideration forward. An oversight precluded committee discussion although it should be noted that the committee chair and one member sit on TLG. Professor Lehmann replied that

the slant of discussion in TLG may differ substantially from that in a purely faculty committee and that at least pro forma the document should be discussed by faculties.

Professor Kaplan registered surprise at the flexibility afforded schools and colleges and asked if they can change the rule on how the tenure clock runs. Professor Stebbins replied no, and that Section II, B, stated this explicitly now. Professor Chudacoff asked if thought had been given to articulating the procedures schools and colleges follow in Tenure review. Professor Green replied that TLG has recognized a need for schools and colleges to develop explicit guidelines and convey these when initial appointments are made.

Professor Stebbins then moved acceptance of both documents; Professor Bailey seconded. Professor Stebbins amended the motion to read "The Regents permit." Professor Bailey amended the motion so that the effective date would be a future date to preclude retroactive application. Amendment carried without objection.

Professor Powell asked for a clarification regarding a change in policy or practice. Virginia Nordby explained that the document would change administrative practice regarding "without tenure." Motion approved by a voice vote; one "nay" vote.

FACULTY PERSPECTIVE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Professor Paul Gikas, member of Board in Control and UM Faculty Representative to the Big 10 and NCAA, opened his remarks by crediting U of M athlete-scholars. Over 600 are involved in athletic programs and several have recently won recognition for their academic achievements.

At the same time, he shares concern with other faculty and Big 10 colleagues about the amount of class time athletes lose because of competitive events. To quantify this loss, the Big 10 compared 1983-84 data to those compiled for 1977-78 for men's sports. A pre-noon departure was counted as 3/4 of a class day; post-noon departure was 1/4 day; and a return after noon was counted as 1 full day lost. Data from each school for each sport were compiled and averaged. Results for 1983-84 show football having the lowest average days lost (2.3) while golf (13.7), basketball (10.5) and tennis (10.0) have the highest. Compared to the 1977-78 season, football showed improvement by reducing absences by one day (to 2.3) while golf, over the same period, doubled its average lost class days (from 7.0 to 13.7.) For the 1983-84 season women's golf and tennis also show the highest lost class days. In general, UM lost class days are lower than the conference averages.

Professor Burdi asked if golfers have lower GPA's than football players.

Professor Gikas replied that correlating GPA's to sports has not been done yet. Professor Bailey observed that the statistics for UM baseball seem low inasmuch as the team is already away on a spring tour prior to the season's opening. Professor Gikas stated that spring tour absences should be reported and statistics may vary from one year to the next. The Academic Performance Committee of the Board in Control has made teams revise their proposed schedules when it judged those schedules to be too heavy for academic performance. He also clarified that intercollegiate competition is anything other than squad competition. Statistics offered by the Big 10 exclude practices. In reply to Professor Thornton's question, he said that classes missed because of home games or competition should be reported as lost days according to the formula. Professor Burdi expressed concern not so much over weekends or days lost to competition as over time spent during each week in practices and work outs raising question about the amount of energy available for academic study.

Professor Gikas observed that the problems identified have no easy solutions. UM tries to fly teams to events to minimize lost class time. Mr. Canham monitors commitments and the Academic Performance Committee tries to minimize the negative impacts. Complications arise from schedules. For example, UM's spring recess doesn't mesh with those of other schools. Yet if the baseball team is to be competitive, some argue, it needs its southern tour. Competition has grown like a neoplasm and is very difficult to control as no school wants to be at a competitive disadvantage. Some athletes thrive on the discipline, training and challenge, while others are taxed to their limits and may compromise their academic performance as a result. It would be difficult for UM exclusively to adopt stringent rules for its own athletes. Rather, changes are more likely to come through organizations whose members will need to examine matters, look at adverse effects, prioritize items needing change, point out benefits to the scholar-athlete and get presidential support for improvements. He welcomes presidential involvement but believes faculty should retain basic control of the NCAA.

Professor Gikas also reported that this is the fourth year of integration of women's athletics in the Big 10. Through a committee chaired by Virginia Nordby, the conference is evaluating that integration. The committee completed its report and submitted it to the Council February 18, 1985.

On behalf of the Assembly, Professor Bailey recognized the effort faculty members of Board in Control spend counseling athletes who have academic performance problems. Professor Gikas noted a logistics problem at the start of each term because grades from the previous term are sometimes submitted late. He asked for faculty cooperation in providing written grades because eligibility cannot be certified until grades are provided.

Professor Rutledge recalled that during his presentation at the January

Assembly meeting, Mr. Canham had been asked about graduation statistics of athletes but could not furnish them. Professor Gikas amplified that UM's graduation rate for basketball players is very respectable but studies of other sports have not been done. Once the Athletic Department finishes computerizing its data, such statistics should be available with greater ease. Professor Easley reported that some statistics for some sports are already available and may be distributed shortly.

Professor Knudsvig asked for an update on the SAT scores issue. Professor Gikas explained that this was NCAA Proposal 48 which is now a bylaw but commonly still called Proposal 48. Its thrust was concern over the marginal academic status of admitted students and especially of minority athletes. The proposal was controversial when submitted and opposed by many historically black colleges. It will take effect August 1986 and its impact will be considerable especially on black athletes. Among the issues is the indicated need for tutorial help to assist students in realizing their inherent academic potential. To help address some of these concerns the Big 10 has established a special advisory committee composed of former black players from each conference school. Appointments will rotate and should shortly include women.

Professor Bulkley agreed that tutoring would improve academic performance but expressed concern about excluding from special treatment non-athletes who are also likely to prosper if given special help. He also stated the importance of sending a message to K-12 schools that improvement throughout the educational system is needed. Professor Gikas agreed that the University can't offer special treatment for athletes that it can't offer for other students. The overall thrust is that students must achieve academic competence and he does not favor diminishing the strength of that message.

Professor Hilbert expressed thanks to Professor Gikas and his colleagues for their work and dedication to this aspect of academic life and wished him well chairing the Big 10 next year.

REPORT ON THE PREPARATION OF THE ANNUAL CESF COMPENSATION REQUEST

Professor Beth Reed, (Chair of CESF), presented a preliminary draft of statistics and noted that because the figures were just newly received, CESF had not yet reviewed them. Thus, CESF may add, delete or revise comments offered today.

The ten private schools listed are those with whom UM traditionally competes for faculty. Data shows decline in UM salary positions relative to these schools. There has been recent improvement for Assistant and Associate Professor salaries but not improvement for Professor. Because the data incorporate raises, Professor Reed was urged to change the title from "...Faculty Salary Program" to "...Faculty Salaries."

Professor Reed observed that the rank of Professor is hardest hit. People in this rank are often less mobile, have stronger community ties and less recent experience in testing their market value. Thus, there have been smaller raises given to the group as a whole, a phenomenon which suggests that the merit system may be giving way to the market system, which in term, may make it more difficult to retain senior faculty and to convince junior faculty that it is in their long-term interests to stay at the U of M.

Professor Cohen asked how CESF wants to deal with the fact that UM salaries are on a par or above the mean of other public universities. Professor Reed replied that the traditional comparison made by the Regents and the Administration is with the private schools whose competition poses the greatest threat to the U of M in attracting and retaining faculty.

Professor Burdi encouraged CESF to have faculty salaries defined as a fixed University cost rather than addressed after other fixed costs are met.

Professor Reed noted that tracking schools in the Southwest has not been profitable because they seem to pay high salaries to a few people and not to distribute in salary monies across-the-board. CESF, however, will continue to collect data from these universities.

Professor Hilbert noted a perception that some schools are emphasizing junior faculty already hired as well as those being courted. Professor Reed voiced uncertainty that UM had this as a conscious policy. If tied to marketability such policy has impact on other groups because market pressures draw money off the top of merit salary pool, leaving less to be distributed as reward for merit. Such variance within rank is not easy to analyze.

Professor Bulkley commended CESF for its work noting its potential for serving the entire faculty. The Assembly concurred through applause.

OLD BUSINESS

Professor Hilbert, noting that it was his final Assembly meeting as Chair, stated that it had been a rewarding, interesting and satisfying experience. He thanked all who had helped and congratulated SACUA especially for their attendance and hard work. He recognized Professor Burdi who was also completing his SACUA term and Judith Nowack, Executive Assistant to SACUA, who is continuing. He also recognized all Assembly members whose terms end today, asked them to stand and expressed appreciation for their contributions.

NEW BUSINESS

Professor Hilbert announced that Professors Charles Lehmann, Harris McClamroch and Daniel Moerman were the new SACUA members.

Senate Assembly Minutes of 3/18/85
Page Seven

Professor Green lauded Professor Hilbert's chairmanship in showing the importance of Senate Assembly, for bringing new vigor to discussion, setting agendas and providing leadership to SACUA.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia B. Yocum
Senate Secretary